REMARKS

Applicant thanks Examiner Al Aubaidi for the Examiner Interview on June 9, 2009.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 10-12, and 14-27 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 8-9, and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 10-12, 14-15, 17, 21-23, and 25 have been amended. Claims 26-27 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments and new claims can be found at least at paragraphs [0010]-[0011] and [0017] and FIG. 2 of the application.

Claims 1-2 and 4-6 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-6, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,738,466 ("LaPierre") in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2006/0104434 ("Nguyen") and U.S. Published Application No. 2005/0047565 ("Nassimi"). Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully traverses the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of the above-cited references do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest comparing, at a controller communicatively coupled to a destination device, a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers, as in claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, LaPierre discloses that when a call is forwarded, a distinctive ring is applied at the destination device to indicate that the call is a forwarded call, as opposed to a normal call. LaPierre further discloses that the number from which the call was redirected can be determined using a caller ID unit. *See* LaPierre, col. 4, line 4 – col. 5, line 7. The cited portions of LaPierre do not disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers. Therefore, the cited portions of LaPierre fail to disclose or suggest comparing, at a controller communicatively coupled to a destination device, a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers, as in claim 1.

In further contrast to claim 1, Nguyen discloses a caller controlled distinctive ring. *See* Nguyen, [0015]. In Nguyen, the calling party determines whether or not a distinctive ring will be applied at a destination device to announce the call. *See* Nguyen, [0017]. The cited portions of Nguyen do not disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of

numbers. Therefore, the cited portions of Nguyen fail to disclose or suggest comparing, at a controller communicatively coupled to a destination device, a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers, as in claim 1.

In further contrast to claim 1, Nassimi discloses a system capable of listening to phone calls, including dial-up Internet sessions, and detecting an incoming phone call or incoming fax. Nassimi further discloses that a first ring (e.g., a long tone) is associated with an incoming phone call and a second ring (e.g., two short tones) is associated with an incoming fax. *See* Nassimi, [0002], [0015]-[0017], [0124], and [0134]. The cited portions of Nassimi do not disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers. Therefore, the cited portions of Nassimi fail to disclose or suggest comparing, at a controller communicatively coupled to a destination device, a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers, as in claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of the above-cited references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2 and 4-6 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Claims 7 and 10 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 7-10, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), under LaPierre in view of Nguyen and Nassimi. Claims 8-9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully traverses the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of the above-cited references do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 7. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers at a controller communicatively coupled to a destination device, as in claim 7.

In contrast to claim 7, LaPierre discloses that when a call is forwarded, a distinctive ring is applied at the destination device to indicate that the call is a forwarded call, as opposed to a normal call. LaPierre further discloses that the number from which the call was redirected can be determined using a caller ID unit. *See* LaPierre, col. 4, line 4 – col. 5, line 7. The cited portions of LaPierre do not disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers. Therefore, the cited portions of LaPierre fail to disclose or suggest comparing a

redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers at a controller communicatively coupled to a destination device, as in claim 7.

In further contrast to claim 7, Nguyen discloses a caller controlled distinctive ring. *See* Nguyen, [0015]. In Nguyen, the calling party determines whether or not a distinctive ring will be applied at a destination device to announce the call. *See* Nguyen, [0017]. The cited portions of Nguyen do not disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers. Therefore, the cited portions of Nguyen fail to disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers at a controller communicatively coupled to a destination device, as in claim 7.

In further contrast to claim 7, Nassimi discloses a system capable of listening to phone calls, including dial-up Internet sessions, and detecting an incoming phone call or incoming fax. Nassimi further discloses that a first ring (e.g., a long tone) is associated with an incoming phone call and a second ring (e.g., two short tones) is associated with an incoming fax. *See* Nassimi, [0002], [0015]-[0017], [0124], and [0134]. The cited portions of Nassimi do not disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers. Therefore, the cited portions of Nassimi fail to disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers at a controller communicatively coupled to a destination device, as in claim 7.

Therefore, the cited portions of the above-cited references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 7. Hence, claim 7 is allowable. Claim 10 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 7.

Claims 11-12 and 14-16 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 11-16, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), under LaPierre in view of Nguyen and Nassimi. Claim 13 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully traverses the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of the above-cited references do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 11. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest receiving a response message from a controller, where the response message indicates that a call request message includes a redirecting number that is in an authorized set of numbers, as in claim 11.

In contrast to claim 11, LaPierre discloses that when a call is forwarded, a distinctive ring is applied at the destination device to indicate that the call is a forwarded call, as opposed to a normal call. LaPierre further discloses that the number from which the call was redirected can be determined using a caller ID unit. *See* LaPierre, col. 4, line 4 – col. 5, line 7. The cited portions of LaPierre do not disclose or suggest that a redirecting number is in an authorized set of numbers. Therefore, the cited portions of LaPierre fail to disclose or suggest receiving a response message from a controller, where the response message indicates that a call request message includes a redirecting number that is in an authorized set of numbers, as in claim 11.

In further contrast to claim 11, Nguyen discloses a caller controlled distinctive ring. *See* Nguyen, [0015]. In Nguyen, the calling party determines whether or not a distinctive ring will be applied at a destination device to announce the call. *See* Nguyen, [0017]. The cited portions of Nguyen do not disclose or suggest that a redirecting number is in an authorized set of numbers. Therefore, the cited portions of Nguyen fail to disclose or suggest receiving a response message from a controller, where the response message indicates that a call request message includes a redirecting number that is in an authorized set of numbers, as in claim 11.

In further contrast to claim 11, Nassimi discloses a system capable of listening to phone calls, including dial-up Internet sessions, and detecting an incoming phone call or incoming fax. Nassimi further discloses that a first ring (e.g., a long tone) is associated with an incoming phone call and a second ring (e.g., two short tones) is associated with an incoming fax. *See* Nassimi, [0002], [0015]-[0017], [0124], and [0134]. The cited portions of Nassimi do not disclose or suggest that a redirecting number is in an authorized set of numbers. Therefore, the cited portions of Nassimi fail to disclose or suggest receiving a response message from a controller, where the response message indicates that a call request message includes a redirecting number that is in an authorized set of numbers, as in claim 11.

Therefore, the cited portions of the above-cited references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 11. Hence, claim 11 is allowable. Claims 12 and 14-16 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 11.

Claims 17-21 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 17-21, under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), as being unpatentable over LaPierre in view of Nguyen and Nassimi. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

The cited portions of the above-cited references do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 17. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest that a call waiting tone is determined based on a redirecting number and that a ring tone is determined based on the redirecting number, as in claim 17.

In contrast to claim 17, LaPierre discloses that when a call is forwarded, a distinctive ring is applied at the destination device to indicate that the call is a forwarded call, as opposed to a normal call. LaPierre further discloses that the number from which the call was redirected can be determined using a caller ID unit. *See* LaPierre, col. 4, line 4 – col. 5, line 7. The cited portions of LaPierre do not disclose or suggest determinations based on a redirecting number. Instead, LaPierre discloses a distinctive ring based on a call type (i.e., forwarded vs. normal). The cited portions of LaPierre do not disclose or suggest that the redirecting number determined from the caller ID unit is used to determine the distinctive ring. Further, the cited portions of LaPierre fail to disclose or suggest call waiting tones determined based on the redirecting number. Therefore, the cited portions of LaPierre fail to disclose or suggest that a call waiting tone is determined based on a redirecting number and that a ring tone is determined based on the redirecting number, as in claim 17.

In further contrast to claim 17, Nguyen discloses a caller-controlled distinctive ring. *See* Nguyen, [0015]. In Nguyen, the calling party determines whether or not a distinctive ring will be applied at a destination device to announce the call. *See* Nguyen, [0017]. The cited portions of Nguyen do not disclose or suggest any determinations based on a redirecting number. Therefore, the cited portions of Nguyen fail to disclose or suggest that a call waiting tone is determined based on a redirecting number and that a ring tone is determined based on the redirecting number, as in claim 17.

In further contrast to claim 17, Nassimi discloses a system capable of listening to phone calls, including dial-up Internet sessions, and detecting an incoming phone call or incoming fax. Nassimi further discloses that a first ring (e.g., a long tone) is associated with an incoming phone call and a second ring (e.g., two short tones) is associated with an incoming fax. *See* Nassimi, [0002], [0015]-[0017], [0124], and [0134]. Nassimi discloses distinctive rings based on the type of incoming communication (i.e., phone vs. fax). The cited portions of Nassimi do not disclose or suggest any determinations based on a redirecting number. Therefore, the cited portions of

Nassimi fail to disclose or suggest that a call waiting tone is determined based on a redirecting number and that a ring tone is determined based on the redirecting number, as in claim 17.

Therefore, the cited portions of the above-cited references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 17. Hence, claim 17 is allowable. Claims 18-21 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 17.

Claims 22-25 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 22-25, under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), as being unpatentable over LaPierre in view of Nguyen and Nassimi. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

The cited portions of the above-cited references do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 22. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest that a call waiting tone is determined based on a redirecting number and that a ring tone is determined based on the redirecting number, as in claim 22.

In contrast to claim 22, LaPierre discloses that when a call is forwarded, a distinctive ring is applied at the destination device to indicate that the call is a forwarded call, as opposed to a normal call. LaPierre further discloses that the number from which the call was redirected can be determined using a caller ID unit. *See* LaPierre, col. 4, line 4 – col. 5, line 7. The cited portions of LaPierre do not disclose or suggest determinations based on a redirecting number. Instead, LaPierre discloses a distinctive ring based on a call type (i.e., forwarded vs. normal). The cited portions of LaPierre do not disclose or suggest that the redirecting number determined from the caller ID unit is used to determine the distinctive ring. Further, the cited portions of LaPierre fail to disclose or suggest call waiting tones determined based on the redirecting number. Therefore, the cited portions of LaPierre fail to disclose or suggest that a call waiting tone is determined based on a redirecting number and that a ring tone is determined based on the redirecting number, as in claim 22.

In further contrast to claim 22, Nguyen discloses a caller-controlled distinctive ring. *See* Nguyen, [0015]. In Nguyen, the calling party determines whether or not a distinctive ring will be applied at a destination device to announce the call. *See* Nguyen, [0017]. The cited portions of Nguyen do not disclose or suggest any determinations based on a redirecting number. Therefore, the cited portions of Nguyen fail to disclose or suggest that a call waiting tone is

determined based on a redirecting number and that a ring tone is determined based on the redirecting number, as in claim 22.

In further contrast to claim 22, Nassimi discloses a system capable of listening to phone calls, including dial-up Internet sessions, and detecting an incoming phone call or incoming fax. Nassimi further discloses that a first ring (e.g., a long tone) is associated with an incoming phone call and a second ring (e.g., two short tones) is associated with an incoming fax. *See* Nassimi, [0002], [0015]-[0017], [0124], and [0134]. Nassimi discloses distinctive rings based on the type of incoming communication (i.e., phone vs. fax). The cited portions of Nassimi do not disclose or suggest any determinations based on a redirecting number. Therefore, the cited portions of Nassimi fail to disclose or suggest that a call waiting tone is determined based on a redirecting number and that a ring tone is determined based on the redirecting number, as in claim 22.

Therefore, the cited portions of the above-cited references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 22. Hence, claim 22 is allowable. Claims 23-25 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 22.

New Claims 26-27 are Allowable

Claims 26-27 depend from claim 7. As explained above, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 7. For example, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest comparing a redirecting number to an authorized set of numbers at a controller communicatively coupled to a destination device, as in claim 7. Therefore, the cited portions of the above-cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claims 26-27, which depend from claim 7. Hence, claims 26-27 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 7.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the references as applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this response, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the cited art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

6-17-2009
Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)